

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 DISTRICT OF OREGON  
5 PORTLAND DIVISION

6 GLASKER JACKSON, )  
7 Plaintiff, ) No. 03:12-cv-00974-HU  
8 vs. ) **FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**  
9 MULTNOMAH COUNTY, and MICHAEL D. ) **ON INITIAL REVIEW OF**  
SCHRUNK, District Attorney, ) **AMENDED COMPLAINT**  
10 Defendants. )  
11

12  
13 Glasker Jackson  
14 13901 S.E. Schiller Street  
Portland, OR 97236

15 Plaintiff *pro se*  
16  
17

18 HUBEL, Magistrate Judge:

19 On June 25, 2012, I granted the plaintiff's application for  
20 leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and performed an initial review  
21 of the plaintiff's Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. I found  
22 the plaintiff had failed to state claims against either of the  
23 named defendants with sufficient clarity for the defendants to  
24 respond. In the interests of justice, I allowed the plaintiff to  
25 file an Amended Complaint, directing him, specifically, to state  
26 the facts and legal basis for each claim he asserted against  
27 Multnomah County, and against District Attorney Michael D. Schrunk.  
28 See Dkt. #5.

1 On July 9, 2012, the plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint.  
2 Dkt. #7. If anything, the plaintiff's claims are even less under-  
3 standable in the amended pleading. In addition to repeating,  
4 verbatim, the factual recitation from his original Complaint, the  
5 plaintiff also asks a number of questions in the amended pleading  
6 regarding procedures employed by the Multnomah County Circuit  
7 Court, and by public defenders appointed by that court. None of  
8 his questions clearly implicates any violation of the federal  
9 Constitution or federal law.

10 The court must dismiss a *pro se* action on initial review, if  
11 the court finds the plaintiff's claims are frivolous, fail to state  
12 a claim for which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief  
13 against a defendant who is immune from the requested relief. 28  
14 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). I find the plaintiff in this case has failed  
15 to allege sufficient facts to establish a violation of any federal  
16 or constitutional law, and he therefore has failed to state any  
17 claim against the two named defendants for which relief may be  
18 granted. Accordingly, I recommend the case be dismissed.

19  
20 **SCHEDULING ORDER**

21 These Findings and Recommendation will be referred to a  
22 district judge. Objections, if any, are due by **September 7, 2012**.  
23 If no objections are filed, then the Findings and Recommendation  
24 will go under advisement on that date. Because the defendants have  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 not yet been served with process and have not, therefore, appeared  
2 in the case, no responses to objections will be received.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated this \_20th\_ day of August, 2012.

5 /s/ Dennis J. Hubel

6 \_\_\_\_\_  
7 Dennis James Hubel  
8 Unites States Magistrate Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28